



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

Applicant	Pixley Irrigation District	County	Tulare
Project Title	2012 Pixley ID Groundwater Banking Investigation	Grant Request	\$ 250,000.00
		Total Project Cost	\$ 283,830.00

Project Description: The Proposal is to continue the development and support of the Pixley Irrigation District (PID) groundwater banking project. The Proposal includes the development of a numeric model, the expansion of PID's monitoring network, and the development of two dedicated monitoring wells.

Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	5
Work Plan	8
Budget	4
Schedule	5
QA/QC	5
Past Performance	4
Geographical Balance	0
Total Score	36

- **GWMP or Program:** A copy of the adopted GWMP for the Deer Creek and Tule River Authority, for which Pixley Irrigation District is a member agency, is included with the grant proposal. Meeting Minutes are included in the application as proof of adoption.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The applicant provides a complete and very detailed project description that includes goals of the proposal, needed facilities, and their location. The project goals are consistent with the goals of the GWMP. A map displaying the affected area of the proposed project is included. Collaboration with other local public agencies in the water management area and an established procedure for public outreach is demonstrated. Letters of support from these local agencies supporting the project are included. Long term need and merit of the proposed project is discussed. Applicant demonstrates that new knowledge and improvement in the management of groundwater are benefits from project implementation. Also, the ongoing use of the product of the proposed project, including how it will be funded is discussed.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion is fully addressed but lacks thorough and well-presented documentation. The applicant provides a complete and detailed description of the project that includes detailed description of each project task. The tasks are consistent with the budget and schedule and fulfill the objectives of the proposal. A strategy for evaluating project progress and performance is included. Access to private property is also discussed. CEQA requirements are addressed in Task 7 – Environmental Documentation. Environmental compliance and permitting are addressed in Task 8 – Permitting and Task 13 – Environmental Compliance/Mitigation/Enhancement. The application lacks any documentation to support assurances to private property access.
- **Budget:** The criterion is addressed but is not thoroughly documented. The budget appears realistic and is consistent with the work plan and schedule. An explanation of how costs were estimated for each task is included. Funding match is included and broken down by task. However, the source of funding match is not identified.
- **Schedule:** The criterion is fully with thorough and well-presented documentation. The timelines for the work to be performed are realistic and agree with the work plan and budget. The tasks are appropriately detailed and defined. The beginning and end dates are within the 2 year grant timeframe and the grantee will be ready to proceed when funding is available.



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

- **QA/QC:** The criterion is fully addressed with thorough and well-presented documentation. The applicant provides a well-defined QA/QC plan that will be used during project implementation. QA/QC measures are incorporated in the work plan. The applicant provides procedural assurances and personnel and consultant qualifications. It also discusses standardized methodologies that will be used as well as comparison and calibration models to provide support to reported data.
- **Past Performance:** The criterion is addressed but is not thoroughly documented. The applicant describes its ability to perform high quality work, manage funds, and meet deadlines for similar types of projects. It describes four projects, of which three were completed within the time frame and on-budget or under budget, and one is in the implementation stage. However, the applicant does not provide supporting documentation to support its claim.